

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.

SL



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,378	06/08/2001	Michael Nelson	Vmware 10	2444
25877	7590	06/30/2004	EXAMINER	
JEFFREY SLUSHER 34825 SULTAN-STARTUP RD. SULTAN, WA 98294			TRUONG, LECHI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SL

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/877,378

Applicant(s)

MICHEAL NELSON

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26,27,44 and 45 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,12,21-24,28,29,33 and 41-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-11,13-20,25,30-32 and 34-40 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10/20/2003 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 24, 28, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonola (US. Patent 5,913,058) in view of Solomon (US. Patent 6,269,409 B1).

3. **As to claim 1**, Bonola teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: hardware processor (the I/O processor, col 3, ln 9-22/ col 4, ln 45-55, col 5, ln 1-20), a first operating system (the host processor, col 3, ln 9-22/ col 4, ln 45-55, col 5, ln 1-20), a most privileged, system level/ direct access col 2, ln 25-27), initializing the computer (boot time, col 5, ln 1-7/ col 7, ln 57-61/ col 9, ln 62-67 to col 10, ln 3-10/ col 2, ln 65-67), a kernel (the real-time kernel, col 3, ln 9-22/ col 4, ln 45-55, col 5, ln 1-20), a second operating system(col 9, ln 39-44), loading the kernel(loads the real-time kernel, col 3, ln 9-21), starting execution of the kernel(the real-time kernel to be loaded into the system memory and executed on the I/O processor prior to the host operating system, col 3, ln 10-21), handed request for the system resource(col 5, ln 15-22).

4. Bonola does not explicit teach the kernel substantially displacing the COS. However, Solomon teaches the kernel substantially displacing the COS (Window NT operating system to

Art Unit: 2126

the base machine into a format that is processed by the Unix operating system, col 7, ln 28-37/ col 2, ln 20-30).

5. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bonola and Solomon because Solomon's Window NT operating system to the base machine into a format that is processed by the Unix operating system would allow for execution for multiple operating systems depend on the emulation of one environment or the other and provide an improvement for concurrently executing multiple operating systems.

6. As to claim 2, Bonola teaches a load call module (the loader program 32, col 7, ln 37-45), the load module (col 8, ln 9-15).

7. As to claim 3, Bonola teaches the load call module as a driver (col 7, ln 40-43).

8. As to claim 24, Bonola teaches halting execution of the kernel(col 8, ln 31-32), reinstalling a state of the first operating system, resuming execution of the first operating system(col 7, ln 12-21), the kernel is removed from the computer(the kernel from the storage device is moved to the system memory, col 15-18/ 25-30)

9. As to claims 28, 29, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 2; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 28, 29 above.

10. Claims 12, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonola (US. Patent 5,913,058) in view of Solomon (US. Patent 6,269,409 B1) and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

11. **As to claim 12**, Bonola and Solomon do not teaches virtual machine, a virtual machine monitor. However, APA teaches virtual machine, a virtual machine monitor(virtual machines, virtual machine monitor, col 2, ln 4-11).

12. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bonola, Solomon and APA because APA's virtual machines, virtual machine monitor would made the computer configuration for resource management more consistent.

13. **As to claim 33**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 33; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 33 above.

14. Claims 21, 22, 41, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonola (US. Patent 5,913,058) in view of Solomon (US. Patent 6,269,409 B1) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Bugnion et al (6,017,938).

15. **As to claim 21**, Bonola, Solomon and APA do not teach mapping a kernel address space into a VMM address space. However Bugnion teaches mapping a kernel address space into a VMM address space (Disco provides ... this organization was selected to match the assumptions made by the operating system, col 9, 50-53).

16. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bonola, Sonola, APA and Bugnio because Bugnio's Disco provides ... this organization was selected to match the assumptions made by the operating system would provide the operating system execute on the plurality of virtual machines and

Art Unit: 2126

transparently share the plurality of computer processors and physical resources through the VMM layer.

17. **As to claim 22**, Bagnio teaches the setting a segment length for the VMM larger than a minimum length necessary to fully contain both the VMM and the kernel (col 10, ln 37-43), free of the any need to change a corresponding segment (col 10, ln 44-50).

18. **As to claim 41, 42**, they are apparatus claim of claim 21, 22 ; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 21, 22.

19. Claims 23, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonola (US. Patent 5,913,058) in view of Solomon (US. Patent 6,269,409 B1) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Subrahmanyam (US. Patent 6,735,601 B1).

20. **As to claim 23**, Bonola, Solomon and APA do not teach virtual disk, virtual disk block pointer, and a file descriptor table storing block identification. However, Subrahmanyam teaches (VDIK/ virtual disk, col 14, ln 60-67/ Fig. 4, block pointer, block hash table, col 15, ln 39-47).

21. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bonola, Solomon, APA and Subrahmanyam because VDSK/ virtual disk, block pointer, block hash table would allow the server to relocate the various blocks according to its own needs using its native algorithms.

22. **As to claim 43**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 23; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 23 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2126

23. Claims 4-11, 13-20, 25, 30-32, 34-38, 39-40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

24. Claims 26, 27, 44, 45 are allowed.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

June 24, 2004


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100